

August 21, 1967

S11926

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I have a speech, and, I suspect, some colloquy with the Senator from Mississippi with respect to the comment in the committee report on antiballistic missile defense.

I agree with the Senator's statement concerning there being no possibility of votes this afternoon. I see no possibility of any votes this afternoon.

Tomorrow, I shall have a speech on the merits of the bill, which speech might take as long as 2 hours. I hope it will be shorter. At the conclusion of that speech, I may submit a motion to recommit with instructions. However, I have not decided definitely whether to do that or not.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will turn to page 7 of the report which deals with the antiballistic missile defense, I would like to read the three paragraphs in those comments and then, with the concurrence of my friend, the Senator from Mississippi, ask the Senator a few questions about the matter.

I read from the top of page 7 under the heading "Antiballistic Missile Defense," as follows:

The recommendations of the committee include \$730 million for the Nike X antiballistic missile defense system, including \$309 million for the initial deployment of the system. There is also available \$153 million appropriated in fiscal year 1967 for the deployment of the system that has not been used. When these funds are considered along with approximately \$88 million in the pending military construction appropriation bill, the total that will be available for this system during fiscal year 1968 totals approximately \$970 million. These funds are adequate to continue the development of the system and for initial deployment. The Congress has met its constitutional responsibilities in this matter, and the responsibility for further delaying this system clearly rests with the executive branch of the Government.

I pause there to ask the Senator if it is not true that all of the funds retitled here were in the administration request.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. These are what we call the budget estimates for 1968. Of course, the \$153 million is a carryover from fiscal year 1967.

Mr. CLARK. The committee did not attempt either to increase or cut the budget figures with respect to further research and development and the possible initial deployment of an antiballistic missile system?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. This is essentially the way the budget was presented to us and the way the Department of Defense presented it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I continue to read from page 7, the second paragraph:

With respect to the \$375 million requested in the President's budget to provide for the initial deployment of the system, the Secretary of Defense advised that these funds would be used if proposed negotiations with the Soviet Union to limit the deployment of antiballistic missile system proved unsuccessful. The committee is not aware of any successes from these proposed negotiations. However, it is the view of the committee that the decision on the deployment of the antiballistic missile system cannot rest on any bilateral agreements reached with the

Soviet Union. To proceed on such a basis ignores the progress being made by Red China in the field of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. Attention is called to the report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, dated August 3, which indicates that Red China could possibly launch an intercontinental nuclear missile attack against the United States by the early 1970's. Furthermore, France has a large supply of nuclear weapons and is not a party to the negotiations.

Then, the third paragraph reads:

It is the view of the committee that the deployment of the Nike X antiballistic missile system should be initiated immediately, and the committee urges the executive branch of the Government to take action accordingly.

It is my understanding that both Secretary McNamara and President Johnson are opposed to the immediate deployment of the Nike X.

Mr. STENNIS. I cannot be certain what their present position is. When the Secretary testified before the committee, which was some time ago, he pointed out that the request for the money was based on the question of whether negotiation with the Soviet Union would be successful, as the report states.

At the time this report was written, we had no further information one way or the other. The report was agreed to on August 3. The report indicated that Red China could possibly launch an international nuclear missile attack by the early 1970's.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend, the Senator from Mississippi, whether in the course of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee extensive testimony was not taken by the committee from Secretary McNamara, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General McConnell, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Johnson, and the Defense Department's Director of Research and Engineering, Mr. John Foster.

The committee went rather exhaustively into this matter, did it not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The committee did go into the matter rather exhaustively, and frankly, we were impressed with the military threat as outlined by the military advisers to the Joint Chiefs, who thought we could not wait longer to have at least an initial start on deployment of the antiballistic missile system.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is aware, is he not, that the Armed Services Committee has also made an investigation of the validity of the antiballistic missile systems and taken considerable testimony on that subject?

Mr. STENNIS. The hearings were joint hearings this year, held by the Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittee on Appropriations. They are the only hearings we have had recently upon the state of development of the Nike X antiballistic missile system.

Mr. CLARK. It is also my understanding that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has expressed its views on this matter?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I do not know whether

the committee took any testimony. Can the Senator enlighten me on that?

Mr. STENNIS. I think they did. I know they issued a very strong report with reference to Red China and her nuclear capacity.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is perhaps aware of the fact that the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Gore), on which subcommittee I also serve, held extensive hearings on the desirability of deploying an antiballistic missile system.

Mr. STENNIS. I remember that those hearings were held. I am not certain as to the dates.

Mr. CLARK. They were held earlier this spring.

As I review the testimony taken by the Appropriations Committee, it seems to me that practically the same witnesses were called as were called before the Subcommittee on Disarmament, except that the Subcommittee on Disarmament had Deputy Secretary Vance instead of Secretary McNamara. However, Deputy Secretary Vance fully represented Secretary McNamara's views.

The subcommittee also heard only from General Wheeler, and not from the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We did, however, have the valuable testimony of two scientists from the Atomic Energy Commission who are engaged in the carrying out of research and development work which makes them experts in the area of an antiballistic missiles system—Dr. May and Dr. Bradbury, one of them was from Los Alamos and the other was from the Livermore agency. We also had the most interesting testimony, which unfortunately was completely deleted, of Mr. Helms, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I believe I attended every one of those hearings, and I came to the conclusion that it would be a tragic mistake for us to deploy the antiballistic missile system at this time; and the speech I am about to make is directed toward this end, as has been an earlier speech which I made on the floor of the Senate perhaps a month ago.

I will now, rather quickly, proceed to that speech, but first I should like to ask my friend, the Senator from Mississippi, whether there is anything in the bill with respect to the deployment or, indeed, to the research and development of the ABM, except the provision on page 16, at line 4, where there is a proviso, "That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph"—which is \$5,478,600,000—" \$269 million shall be available only for the Nike X antiballistic missile system."

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator restate his question? Is there any other—

Mr. CLARK. Is there any other reference to the appropriations for the ABM System?

Mr. STENNIS. No. The Senator is correct. This is the only place. The language on page 16 does tie those funds down for that purpose, and that purpose only.

Will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes in order to make an observation?